

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In this supplemental amendment, claims 1, 5-6, 8, 12-13, 15, 21, 25, 27, 30, 33, and 36 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicant submits that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

The undersigned representative for applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on March 30, 2010. The applicant's amendments presented in the response to the Final Office Action mailed October 30, 2009 were discussed. The undersigned representative for applicant explained the claimed invention to the Examiner. No formal agreement was reached as to any claims.

Claims 1-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35-36 and 38-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adobe After Effect Version 4.0 of 07/15/1999 ("After-Effects") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,919,249 to Herbstman et al. ("Herbstman").

Amended claim 1 includes "rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by a process manager that includes adding an edit feature to the original frame to create a revised frame, and storing the edit feature added to the original frame in a file for the revised frame; automatically creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the revised frame by a proxy editor while still performing the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by the process manager, the proxy including a simulation of the rendered one or more modifications that includes the added edit feature to the original frame; sending the proxy to a

display device; displaying, by the display device, the proxy of the revised frame during the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame.”(emphasis added).

The portions in After-Effects cited by the Examiner (After-Effects, page 12, lines 1-4) disclose that “Effects and properties applied to the proxy are applied to the actual footage when the movie is rendered with Use No Proxies selected from the Proxy Use menu in the Render Settings dialog box.” In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to automatically creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the revised frame by a proxy editor while still performing the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by the process manager. After-

Effect fails to disclose rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by a process manager that includes adding an edit feature to the original frame to create a revised frame, and storing the edit feature added to the original frame in a file for the revised frame; automatically creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the revised frame by a proxy editor while still performing the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 1.

Herbstman, in contrast, discloses the user interface containing custom render settings that includes proxy use. Herbstman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by a process manager that includes adding an edit feature to the original frame to create a revised frame, and storing the edit feature added to the original frame in a file for the revised frame; automatically creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the revised frame by a proxy editor while still performing the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if After-Effects and Herbstman were combined, such a combination would still lack automatically creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the revised

frame by a proxy editor while still performing the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over After-Effects in view of Herbstman.

Amended claim 27 reads, in part, as follows: “adding an edit feature to the first frame by a process manager if the first frame requires the modification to create a second frame; storing the edit feature in a file for the second frame by the process manager; and creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the second frame by a proxy editor that includes a simulation of the added edit feature to the first frame, wherein the creating the proxy is performed while still continuing to add the edit feature to the first frame and store the edit feature added to the first frame in the file for the second frame by the process manager.”(emphasis added).

As set forth above, the portions in After-Effects cited by the Examiner (After-Effects, page 12, lines 1-4) disclose that “Effects and properties applied to the proxy are applied to the actual footage when the movie is rendered with Use No Proxies selected from the Proxy Use menu in the Render Settings dialog box.” In contrast, amended claim 27 refers to creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the second frame by a proxy editor that includes a simulation of the added edit feature to the first frame, wherein the creating the proxy is performed while still continuing to add the edit feature to the first frame and store the edit feature added to the first frame in the file for the second frame by the process manager.

Herbstman, in contrast, discloses the user interface containing custom render settings that includes proxy use. Herbstman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the second frame by a proxy editor that includes a simulation of the added edit feature to the first frame, wherein the creating the proxy is performed while still

continuing to add the edit feature to the first frame and store the edit feature added to the first frame in the file for the second frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 27.

Furthermore, even if Herbstman and After-Effects were combined, such a combination would still lack creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the second frame by a proxy editor that includes a simulation of the added edit feature to the first frame, wherein the creating the proxy is performed while still continuing to add the edit feature to the first frame and store the edit feature added to the first frame in the file for the second frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 27.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 27, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over After-Effects in view of Herbstman.

For at least the reasons that are similar to those reasons as set forth above with respect to amended claim 1, or amended claim 27 applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35-36 and 38-40 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over After-Effects in view of Herbstman.

Claims 1-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35-36 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over After-Effects in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,215,485 to Phillips (“Phillips”).

As set forth above, After-Effects fails to disclose automatically creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the revised frame by a proxy editor while still performing the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 1.

Phillips, in contrast, discloses storing effects descriptions from a nonlinear editor using field chart and/or pixel coordinate data for use by a compositor. Phillips fails to disclose, teach, or suggest automatically creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the revised

frame by a proxy editor while still performing the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if After-Effects and Phillips were combined, such a combination would still lack automatically creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the revised frame by a proxy editor while still performing the rendering the one or more modifications to the original frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over After-Effects in view of Phillips.

As set forth above, After-Effects fails to disclose creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the second frame by a proxy editor that includes a simulation of the added edit feature to the first frame, wherein the creating the proxy is performed while still continuing to add the edit feature to the first frame and store the edit feature added to the first frame in the file for the second frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 27.

Phillips, in contrast, discloses storing effects descriptions from a nonlinear editor using field chart and/or pixel coordinate data for use by a compositor. Phillips fails to disclose, teach, or suggest creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the second frame by a proxy editor that includes a simulation of the added edit feature to the first frame, wherein the creating the proxy is performed while still continuing to add the edit feature to the first frame and store the edit feature added to the first frame in the file for the second frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 27.

Furthermore, even if Phillips and After-Effects were combined, such a combination would still lack creating a proxy which is a pseudo rendered version of the second frame by a proxy editor that includes a simulation of the added edit feature to the first frame, wherein the creating the proxy is performed while still continuing to add the edit feature to the first frame and

store the edit feature added to the first frame in the file for the second frame by the process manager, as recited in amended claim 27.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 27, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over After-Effects in view of Phillips.

For at least the reasons that are similar to those reasons as set forth above with respect to amended claim 1, or amended claim 27 applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35-36, and 38-40 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over After-Effects in view of Phillips.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes that a teleconference would assist in prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 720-8300. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 022666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 31, 2010

By: /Tatiana Rossin/
Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No.: 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
Tel: (408) 720-8300

Customer No. 045217